

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### ***Specification***

In the specification, the paragraph beginning at page 11, line 12 and continuing through line 18 has been amended to correct a minor editorial problem, that “the golf club shaft 19” at page 11, line 16, objected to by the examiner, should read “the golf club shaft 16”.

### ***Claim Rejections***

Claims have been cancelled, and new claims 14-20 have been added.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The examiner has rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the examiner cited the limitation that the guide pad “have a length insufficient to form an obstruction.” Claims 1-13 have been cancelled, and new claims 14-20 have been added. The new claims do not contain the phrase “having a length insufficient to form an obstruction when used with a second glove”. Therefore, it is believed that the added claims are fully responsive to the examiner’s concerns.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. section 102(b) as being anticipated by Swanson (U.S. 4,000,903). Claims 1 and 3-5 have been cancelled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson (U.S. 4,000,903). Claim 2 has been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson (U.S. 4,000,903) in view of Bach (U.S. 4,329,741). Claim 6 has been cancelled.

The Office action states that claim 8 and its dependents would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office action. It is believed that the examiner meant to cite independent claim 7 (directed to a pair of golf gloves) and its dependents as containing allowable subject matter if rewritten or amended, rather than dependent claim 8, especially since independent claim 7 was not specifically addressed in this section of the Office action. New independent claim 14 no longer includes the limitation that prompted the section 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 7 (now canceled), and it is believed that the new claims are fully responsive to the examiner's concerns.

Appl. No. 10/664,401  
Amdt. Dated Oct. 18, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 19, 2004

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Law Offices of Peter S. Canelias

October 18, 2004

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Peter S. Canelias  
Reg. No. 40,547  
420 Lexington Avenue-Suite 2148  
New York, NY 10170  
Tel: (212) 223-9654  
Fax: (212) 223-9651